Dear Howard, 1/19/74

I read your preface last night and am flattered. There are a few places where your editor will pick up a few things if you have not. I think it is better this way than the way you first proposed. One you should not miss is the non-sequitur "modest means" after the quote. There is no relationship between understanding and means. It is true that what eventuated, if not in its precise form, was clearly visible and was seen. That has been one of the greater frustrations.

The problem is not that developments can't be anticipated. It is rather the refusal to see what is seen, what is clear enough, what is logical, what history alone says is coming.

I began addressing this in public appearances in 1966 and in writing as early as WWII. But nobody would see.

Except plagiarizers.

But countless others must have seen the same things.

I have corrected the letter on the scholarship. I hope Lil will type it today.

I appear not to have a Vidal duplicate. Perhaps I mailed it to the Whites. I'll ask Lesar if he has one. If nothing else I'll lend you mine so you can duplicate it. Because of the size of the pages my equipment is ill suited.

If you dod not get the Esquire anniversary edition, I have duplicates of some if not all the pieces. It is not worth much. Ditto for Penthouse, worthless or worse.

I do have Szulc's book on Hunt. And a duplicate of Marchetti's novel, The Rope Dancers. If you see a copy of Hunt's The Coven, it may be worth reading. I willwant to get a copy. Fawcett reprint.

Later. Available locally and a copy is being held for me.

Lil has retyped the letter and I enclose it. We wonder if my accrediting of myself detracts? I did it so they might feel they have reason to believe me but maybe it is not a good thing to do. One reason I sent you unread carbon. Good luck,